

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henley, U.S. Pat. No. 5,459,410 ("Henley") in view of Yamamoto et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,600,460 ("Yamamoto"). Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Henley. Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henley in view of Imura et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,239,856. Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ukai et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,086,347 ("Ukai") in view of Imura. Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 6 has been canceled. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections because Henley (with or without Yamamoto) does not disclose or suggest forming contact holes for repairing disconnected wirings that are wider than the disconnected wirings.

Applicants' amended claim 1 recites forming disconnection repairing contact holes that are formed larger in width than the disconnected wirings so as to expose upper surfaces and both side surfaces of the respective disconnected wirings, and then forming two conductive films so as to electrically connect to the respective disconnected wirings through the respective disconnection repairing contact holes. By connecting one terminal of the two conductive films, which are connected to the disconnected wirings in the other terminals of the two conductive films through one or more pixel electrodes, the disconnected wirings can be connected to each other through the conductive films and the pixel electrodes. Since the disconnection repairing contact

holes are wider than the wirings so as to expose upper surfaces and both side surfaces of the respective disconnected wirings, they are capable of increasing contact area between the wiring and the conductive film for repair.

In contrast, in Henley, contact holes for repairing wirings are formed narrower in width than the wirings. Though the conductive film for repair contacts only an upper surface of the wiring, the conductive film never contacts a side surface of the wiring. With this, it is impossible to increase contact area between the wiring and the conductive film for repair.

Further, Yamamoto discloses a pixel electrode that contacts the respective wirings which are disconnected and thus separated from each other. It does not disclose contact holes for repair.

Thus, the present invention cannot be derived from a combination of Henley and Yamamoto. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of amended claim 1 and claims 2 and 5 under § 103(a).

Applicants' claim 3 recites disconnection repairing contact holes that are formed larger in width than the disconnected wirings so as to expose upper surfaces and both side surfaces of the respective disconnected wirings. Then, a conductive film is formed so as to directly and electrically connect to the respective disconnected wirings through the respective disconnection repairing contact holes.

In contrast, as described above, in Henley, contact holes for repairing wirings are formed narrower in width than the wirings, and thus, Henley does not disclose or suggest the invention as recited in claim 3. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claim 3, and claim 4, which depends from claim 3, are allowable for at least the reasons given and request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 3 under § 102(b).

For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicant's attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Charles C. Claunch
Registration No. 51,221

November 10, 2003

300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978
K:\1508\65377\Amend A.doc